

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1 – 2 and 10 – 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 3 – 9, 13, 16, and 19 have been amended, and claims 22 -30 have been added. Accordingly, claims 3 – 9 and 13 – 30 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 22, and 23 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Specification Objection

In the Office Action, the specification on page 9 was objected to as designating the wrong notation. As shown above, the Applicants have amended the specification on page 9, line 15 to recite to the correct notation.

Additionally, the specification on page 22, line 10 was objected to as being confusing. Applicants have amended the specification on page 22, line 10, as shown above, to better clarify the invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is moot. Claim 9 is amended to clarify. This amendment is made for the sole purpose of clarifying claim 9. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish and subject matter by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 9.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 4,970,022 issued to Scheuble *et al.* ("Scheuble"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 – 11, 13 – 14, 16 – 17 , and 19 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,716,491 issued to Tarumi *et al.* or US 2002/0030180 applied by Tarumi *et al.* ("Tarumi"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. .

Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 11, and 13 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent JP 2002-12871 ("Poetsch"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 is moot. Claims 3 – 9, 13, 16, and 19 have been amended, and new claims 22 – 30 have been submitted for the Examiner's consideration.

Newly amended independent claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, and 19 and newly submitted independent claims 22 and 23 are not anticipated by Scheuble, Tarumi or Poetsch, because the references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Specifically, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 5 with $-C\equiv C-$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 3 and 13, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 6 with $-C\equiv C-$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 5 and 16, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 7 with 1 as symbol I”, as recited by independent claim 7 and 19, and nowhere the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “one or more compounds selected from a group consisting of the nematic liquid crystal compounds represented by the following Chemical Formula 9”, as recited by independent claims 22 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection. Since the prior art references of record fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 22, and 23, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 12, 15, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,716,491 issued Tarumi *et al.* in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 2002-12871 issued to Poetsch *et al.*

Claims 1 – 11, 13 – 14, 16 – 17, and 19 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,716,491 issued to Tarumi *et al.* or US 2002/0030180 applied by Tarumi *et al.*

Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 11, and 13 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent JP 2002-12871 (“Poetsch”).

Claims 1 – 2, and 10 – 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 2, and 10 – 12 is moot.

Newly amended independent claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, and 19 are not obvious in view of Scheuble, Tarumi, and Poetsch under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Specifically, the Tarumi, Scheuble and Poetsch references fail to teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 5 with $\text{-C}\equiv\text{C-}$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 3 and 13, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 6 with $\text{-C}\equiv\text{C-}$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 5 and 16, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 7 with 1 as symbol I”, as recited by independent claim 7 and 19.

Newly submitted independent claims 22 and 23 are not obvious in view of Scheuble, Tarumi, and Poetsch under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Specifically, the Tarumi, Scheuble and Poetsch references fail to teach or suggest a composition comprising “one or more compounds selected from a group consisting of the nematic liquid crystal compounds represented by the following Chemical Formula 9”, as recited by independent claims 22 and 23.

The Poetsch reference also fails to remedy the deficiencies of the primary reference. Like the Tarumi reference, the Poetsch reference fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 22 and 23. Specifically, for example, the Tarumi, Scheuble and Poetsch references fail to teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 5 with $\text{-C}\equiv\text{C-}$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 3 and 13, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “Formula 6 with $\text{-C}\equiv\text{C-}$ as symbol B”, as recited by independent claim 5 and 16, nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition

comprising “Formula 7 with 1 as symbol I”, as recited by independent claim 7 and 19, and nowhere do the references teach or suggest a composition comprising “one or more compounds selected from a group consisting of the nematic liquid crystal compounds represented by the following Chemical Formula 9”, as recited by independent claims 22 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection. Since none of the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 22 and 23, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.


CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 20, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:NHK/gjb